STEERING COMMITTEE ON DATA-BASED COURT PERFORMANCE AND DATA STANDARDS

December 1, 2021

9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Hybrid Meeting

Present: Hon. James Beene, Ms. Shelly Bacon, Hon. Thomas Chotena, Ms. Jennifer Curtiss, Hon. Pamela Frasher-Gates, Ms. Shawn Friend, Hon. Ken Lee, Ms. Donna McQuality, Hon. Michael Peterson, Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer, Ms. Charrise Richards, Hon. Keith Russell, Mr. Eric Silverberg, and Hon. Don Taylor

Absent: Hon. Jill Davis, Mr. Rich McHattie

Presenters/Guests: Mr. Gil Bensinger

Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC): Ms. Sarah Baker, Mr. Stewart Bruner, Ms. Catherine Clarich, Mr. Michael Malone, Mr. Patrick McGrath, Ms. Laura Ritenour, Mr. Craig Washburn

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The December 1, 2021 meeting of the Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards was called to order by the Chair, Honorable James Beene, at 9:01 a.m. The Chair conducted member roll call. The Chair mentioned that Administrative Order 2021-171, which extended the term of this committee, was signed and published last month allowing the committee to continue their work regarding data and time standards. All members were thanked for their continued service. Michael "Mike" Malone was introduced as the new Court Services Director and is replacing Marcus Reinkensmeyer, who is now the Deputy Director for the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC).

B. Approval of the September 22, 2021 Minutes

The draft minutes from the September 22, 2021 meeting of the Steering Committee on Data-Based Court Performance and Data Standards were presented for approval. The Chair called for any omissions or corrections to the minutes.

A motion was made by Judge Ken Lee and seconded by Judge Michael Peterson to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

Draft 12/8/2021 Page 1 of 5

II. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. October Presiding Judge and AJC Meetings

Mr. Marcus Reinkensmeyer gave an overview on his presentation to the Presiding Judges and Arizona Judicial Court meetings in October on the National Open Court Data Standards (NODS) and the new processes to be implemented based on 2021 Legislation. All of the NODS recommended by this committee were presented as well as the event codes needed to implement 2021 legislative topics like Proposition 207 and other items. The Arizona Judicial Council voted to approve the recommended NODS and new event codes.

B. Arizona Standard Data Elements Implementation

Mr. Reinkensmeyer provided an overview of the next steps in the implementation of the Arizona Standard Data Elements. A new code section is being developed and will be sent to the committee members soon for their input. A phased approach to the project implementation is being developed and it will include data quality components, court documentation and training. Mr. Reinkensmeyer also mentioned the code translation tool that might be available to assist courts with interfacing with the AOC regarding the new standard data elements.

C. Data Standardization Workgroup Update

Mr. Patrick McGrath provided an update on the Data Standardization Workgroup. This group's purpose is two-fold: (1) to review new code requests and (2) to standardize elements needed for data sharing. At the November meeting, Karl Heckart, AOC's Chief Information Officer, gave an update on the AOC mapping tool pilot project with Pima County Superior Court. The workgroup reviewed code standardization requests from Glendale Municipal Court and recommended the Veteran's Court Calendar Session Type as a statewide standard. Discussion was held and a motion was made by Judge Keith Russell and seconded by Mr. Eric Silverberg to recommend for adoption of the Calendar Session Type "Veterans' Court" as a statewide standard. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. McGrath reported that staff will work with courts statewide to compile a list of specialty courts so that the entire set of calendar session types can be presented to the workgroup for recommendations to be presented at the March 2022 committee meeting.

Mr. McGrath presented three tables the workgroup reviewed and finalized that are required for current and future statewide integration projects. Mr. McGrath first presented the Address Type table.

CODE	DESCRIPTION
AT	ATTORNEY ADDRESS
EB	EMPLOYMENT/ BUSINESS
GD	GENERAL DELIVERY
IA	INCARCERATION AGENCY

Draft 12/8/2021 Page 2 of 5

OT	OTHER
РО	P.O. BOX
PU	PARTIAL/ UNKNOWN
RL	RELATIVE
RS	RESIDENCE
SC	SCHOOL

Discussion was held and a motion was made by Mr. Reinkensmeyer and seconded by Judge Peterson to recommend for adoption the Address Type table as a statewide standard. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. McGrath then presented the Address Status table.

CODE	DESCRIPTION		
ACT	ACTIVE		
UND	UNDELIVERABLE		
FUT	FUTURE		
PRI	PRIOR		
PRI	PRIMARY		
PRO	PROTECTED		

Discussion was held and a motion was made by Ms. Shelly Bacon and seconded by Ms. Jennifer Curtiss to recommend for adoption the Address Status table as a statewide standard. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. McGrath lastly presented the Alias Type table.

CODE	DESCRIPTION
AKA	ALSO KNOWN AS
DBA	DOING BUSINESS AS
FKA	FORMERLY KNOWN AS
MDN	MAIDEN NAME
MAR	MARRIED NAME
NKA	NOW KNOWN AS
LEG	LEGAL NAME

Discussion was held and a motion was made by Judge Ken Lee and seconded by Ms. Reinkensmeyer to recommend for adoption the Alias Type table as a statewide standard. The motion passed unanimously.

The next meeting of the Data Standardization Workgroup will be in January 2022. At that meeting, analysis and recommendations for tables and data elements will be continued and implementation plans will be discussed.

D. Felony Time Standards Workgroup

Judge Pamela Gates, as chair of the workgroup, presented on their work and recommendations. The workgroup discussed the current standards and factors

Draft 12/8/2021 Page 3 of 5

outside of the court's control that can lead to a time standard not being met. The workgroup felt the Tier One standard needed to be altered to recognize that prosecuting agencies' practices like substance abuse treatment, when plea offers are offered, and discovery issues greatly impact time to disposition. Judge Gates discussed best practices enacted by some courts and challenges some of those tools can present. Judge Gates then explained the workgroup's recommendations regarding the new proposed Tier One and Tier Two recommendations (Tier One -120 days, Tier Two - 210, 240 and 270 days) and the rationale behind these numbers. Data was submitted by the courts and AOC showing what the rate of compliance results would be with these proposed standards. Judge Gates let the committee know that the workgroup membership included a cross-section of criminal judges and court administrators from outside this committee. Judge Peterson mentioned this topic will be discussed by the presiding judges at their meeting next week and hopes presiding judges will use this summary to initiate discussion with their county stakeholders on best practices and possible system changes that can lead to improved outcomes. He complimented Judge Gates and the workgroup members on their efforts to learn more about why the system is having criminal cases to begin with and how justice partners can collaborate further.

E. PO Contest Hearing Time Standards

The PO Contested Hearing case type still does not have a final case processing time standard adopted. Ms. Laura Ritenour presented on the current provisional time standard and a new proposed time standard for measuring between the respondent's request for hearing and the first hearing date. There was some discussion about changing the measure to stop time at the first hearing setting instead of stopping time when the hearing is resolved. There is also no exclusion of time in this standard like many other standards for extraordinary circumstances. Members discussed ideas on having the standard measure follow A.R.S. § 13-3602 and Rule 38 of the Arizona Rules of Protective Order Procedure instead. Members felt ensuring that statute and code was being followed was significant. It was decided that more research needs to be conducted on the proposed alternatives to the standard. Ms. Ritenour will look into what results might look like for this proposed standard and bring ideas and issues to the next meeting.

F. Publication of Time Standards

Justice Beene reminded the members that the publishing of the results of the time standards has always been a goal for the court. Publication can take many different forms, such as statewide charts or by individual court. The appellate courts have long published their time standards, and publication could follow a similar presentation. Mr. Reinkensmeyer presented on the history of the time standards and ideas for publishing them. Possible ideas presented include adding them to the AOC's interactive dashboard page at Statistics (azcourts.gov) or adding them to the Chief Justice's Annual Report. Data could be displayed at the state, county, or court level. The committee discussed various ideas and

Draft 12/8/2021 Page 4 of 5

suggestions included the need to ensure plenty of context and background is presented with data no matter the form of the presentation and mentioning the effect of the public health emergency had on data and various nuances that can occur with particular case types. It was also discussed the large variations in volume in rural versus metropolitan courts that can affect the results of the report. It was mentioned that the juvenile time standards might need further research and input from subject matter experts to ensure the data being collected is from the expected source and is reliable. Mr. Reinkensmeyer will present and discuss this topic at the presiding judges meeting next week.

III. CALL TO PUBLIC

Justice Beene made a call to the public. There was none.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by motion at 10:41 p.m.

V. NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

March 2, 2022 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Hybrid - State Courts Building & Zoom

Draft 12/8/2021 Page 5 of 5